

THE FORGOTTEN HUMANISM OF RABBI SAMSON RAPHAEL HIRSCH

By Rabbi Mayer Schiller

What does it mean to be a Jew and an American citizen?¹ How should Jews be relating to societies predominantly Gentile, their cultures, traditions, customs, art and so forth? What about individual Gentiles? What should be our approach to them?

These and a host of other related questions are the practical outgrowth of several deeper queries. Deeper in the sense that they strike at the very roots of the nature of humanity, its purpose and destiny. Among these latter questions might be, What precisely is a Gentile?² What is his purpose and significance in God's world?³ How does he fulfill his destiny? What is a Catholic, Protestant, Moslem, Buddhist, etc. in the eyes of God?⁴ What is a Gentile nation in the metaphysics of the cosmos?⁵ Now, these are not merely questions debatable by arm chair philosophers and academicians substituting reflection about life for life itself.⁶ They have profound repercussions as their answers impact upon the more practical issues raised in the first paragraph and, indeed, upon the way Jews are to live and view their lives in Gentile society.

Let us continue to pose some particularly uncomfortable questions. Rabbi Kahane and his supporters in Israel have raised some troublesome points about Judaism and the dogmas of Enlightenment spawned political theory. Can an Orthodox faith embrace majority rule, 1789 political "rights," religious neutrality of the government, Anglo-Saxon due process and assorted other like notions? If the answer to the above be "no"⁷ (and certainly a very good case could be made that it is "no") then the resultant question is how should a Jew approach the way a Gentile orders *his* society? Clearly, historically we have favored the trend in the West towards a civil or contractual "vision" of the realm. Was this merely a clever tactic? Was it an attempt to protect ourselves by weakening the religious (or racial) fabric of Gentile order?⁸ In other words is there one standard to be applied to Gentiles (pluralist-secularist) and another to Jews (homogenous-sacred)?

Those on the right of Orthodoxy would have little problems with just such a formulation. To them, Gentiles are largely means used by God to punish, test or protect us. Their personal destiny is of vastly secondary concern to the Creator. In this category we must include not only the traditional right, but many of the new generation of

West Bank Religious Zionists as well. To all these schools the question of the meaning or destiny of Gentile nations and individual Gentiles is rarely, if ever considered. Thus in *galut* whatever methodology is effective in protecting or furthering our own interests should be adopted regardless of its effect on Gentile faith, nations, morals, education or salvation.⁹

TROUBLESOME QUESTIONS FOR HUMANISTS

Indeed, (if we may be troublesome just a bit longer) much of the Jewish commitment to the Left of past centuries seems to have been in many cases an extension (often under totally secular auspices) of the above belief. Why were Jews socialists in the twenties and capitalists in the eighties? Why were Jews "soft" on Communism for decades until just recently? Why did Jews suddenly become hard liners on crime, education, and so forth after advocating progressive causes for centuries? What prompted *Commentary*, *Public Interest*, *The New Republic* and all the "neo-cons" to their new found faith? Could it not be argued that all the above causes commanded either Jewish assent or criticism dependent upon our personal relationship to the stakes involved i.e. our changing economic position in society, Communism as a "threat" to Israel, the dangers of urban living in multi-racial plural, progressive society, the collapse of higher education etc. In fact, one feels a certain admiration for the staff at *Tikkun* who have at least remained consistent in their Leftism. (Obviously we speak of a tendency, much Jewish humanism was and still is sincere.) Stated conceptually wasn't there always an inherent conflict between egalitarianism/pluralism and ethnicity/Orthodoxy?¹⁰

Modern Orthodox thinkers are not as comfortable as Eastern European traditionalists or Messianic West Bankers with an abandonment of the liberal humanist tradition.¹¹ They try via an assortment of maneuverings to still pledge absolute faith to the dogmas of 1789 while believing in Absolutes. Their well intentioned approach generally collapses when put to the Israeli litmus test. What do they really feel about majority rule, missionary rights, the political and civil rights of Arabs in Israel and Palestinians on the West Bank? Eventually, they will generally be forced to say that Jews and Israel are different. Catholic France should be liberal (secular, civil contract) but not Jewish Israel.

Rabbi Mayer Schiller is a maggid shiur at Yeshiva University High School for Boys. He is currently at work on a doctrinal history of Hassidism.

“MODERN ORTHODOX THINKERS ARE NOT AS COMFORTABLE AS EASTERN EUROPEAN TRADITIONALISTS OR MESSIANIC WEST BANKERS WITH AN ABANDONMENT OF THE LIBERAL HUMANIST TRADITION.”

The problem is not a simple one. Not by a long stretch. *Halacha* frequently differentiates between Jew and Gentile, generally understandably, but sometimes in a painfully, puzzling manner. Although various apologetics have been offered for assorted *balachot* of this sort, many problems remain to discomfort sincere Jewish humanists.

Let me relate two personal anecdotes on the matter. Last year in a class of mine on Jewish Philosophy at a prominent Modern Orthodox High School, I mentioned something about the suffering people of Belfast. Quick as a wink one of the students piped up, “Who cares what happens in Belfast? What does it have to do with us? Let them kill each other!”

(My response was, “I see, but all Americans have to care about Soviet Jews, don’t they?”)

A few months ago a cab driver of mine—a recently arrived refugee from Communist China—asked me a question. “You a Rabbi, no? Let me ask you a question. Why Rabbis who drive bus always cut me off? Why they always force me off road? Why Rabbi do that?”

Yes, well, why indeed? It is not merely coincidental. It is a direct outgrowth of the above described attitude of disdain and condescension. Of course, as Jews our *primary* concern is with Jews. Of course, we recognize deep, spiritual differences between Jews and non-Jews. Yet, why must primary concern yield indifference (or worse) to others and why must an awareness of distinctions yield a critically flawed morality?

THE HIRSCHIAN ALTERNATIVE

All right we’ve asked enough questions. It is time to explore alternatives, alternatives seemingly forgotten, but, to this writer’s mind painfully relevant. Not all Torah Jews have understood our sacred literature in the above described fashion of double standards.¹² Not all Jews have seen only Jewish nationalism as meaningful or, in fact, deserving of our loyalty. Not all Jews have viewed their larger Gentile communities as avenues for self advancement. There have been many Torah Jews who have adopted this alternative approach. (Perhaps not as many as we’d like to think sometimes, though.)¹³ One, however, stands out as a veritable giant in this regard, namely, Rabbi Samson Raphael Hirsch. It is our contention that his approach is a refreshing antidote to the duality posed by crass insularity on the one hand and secular, Leftist pluralism on the other.

JEWISH PATRIOTISM

Let us first examine the novel Hirschian treatment of patriotism. Yes, patriotism, a loyalty, heavily interwoven with love, for our nation.¹⁴ Not the Jewish people (who, of course, we must love) but the Gentile nation amongst whom we live. Writing in *Horeb* R. Hirsch’s words sound strange in an era in which heartfelt patriotism has been rendered “silly” or “primitive” by the *zeitgeist*.¹⁵

God . . . demands that every Jew find his own well-being only in that of the country . . . in whichever land Jews shall live as citizens . . . they shall honor and love the princes and government as their own . . . contribute with every possible power to their good . . .

It is . . . a duty imposed by God and no less holy than all the others, in whatever land they shall dwell in, not only to fulfill all the duties which the laws of that land explicitly lay down, but over and above that, to do with thoughts, word and deed everything that can contribute to the weal of the nation . . . to give honestly and joyously all that the community demands for the common good from the individual in the way of treasure, energy and wisdom; and to sacrifice even life itself when the Fatherland calls its sons to its defense. But this outward obedience to the laws must be joined by the inner obedience: i.e. to be loyal to the state with the heart and mind, loyal to the kings, to guard the honor of the state with love and pride, to strive with enthusiasm wherever and whenever you can so that the nation’s institutions shall prosper, so that every aim which your country has set as its national goal shall be achieved and furthered . . .¹⁶

This is obviously a far cry from our current situation in the American Orthodox community. Indeed, it is a far cry from the situation in every country of the Western world not only among Jews, but among Gentiles as well. The trendy, childish selfishness (born of totalitarian, media capitalism) which poisons the mind and heart of Western man affects all, regardless of religion. However, the Jew if sincere in his Orthodoxy is not incapable of sacrifice for his faith and fellow Jews. His abstention from the Hirschian

“WHAT R. HIRSCH PRESENTS US WITH IS THE STARTLING (TODAY AT LEAST) NOTION THAT JEWS BY LIVING IN A COUNTRY OWE THAT LAND AND ITS INSTITUTIONS THEIR LOYALTY AND LOVE.”

patriotic agenda is rooted in the world views we outlined above.¹⁷

We are not concerned here (nor was R. Hirsch in his lasting doctrinal writings) to outline a specific political agenda for the commonwealth. In the Rabbiner's case German patriotism expressed itself in a devotion to brotherhood and tolerance. His inspiration came from Schiller not Goethe, rationalism as opposed to romanticism. Be that as it may. It is of no consequence for our discussion. What R. Hirsch presents us with is the startling (today at least) notion that Jews by living in a country owe that land and its institutions their loyalty and love. It is a duty of both Divine and human origin.

In fact, the Hirschian Kehilla functioned in accordance with his imperatives.¹⁸ They loved Germany and served her long and hard right up to the end. Ah, there's the rub. "Right up to the end." One of the horrible ironies of the twentieth century is that in precisely those two states where Jews tried the hardest to be patriots, Germany and Italy,¹⁹ was born the most evil and maniacal persecution of Jews by Gentiles. Was this a refutation of the Hirschian thesis by God? Were Jews being told to get out of Gentile nations? Was Hirschian patriotism invalidated by the Holocaust?

If, yes, then glaring questions emerge. What then are we doing here in America now? In the name of what do we vote and seek to influence the policy of American communities? In what way are we any longer citizens? To whom are our loyalties? Only to ourselves? Yes, well, is that what we say? Is that made clear to all other members of the American body politic?

JEWISH-GENTILE RELATIONS

Let us briefly leave these difficult questions alone for a moment and turn to the related question of Jewish-Gentile relations. In 1884, R. Hirsch published a pamphlet entitled "The Talmud and Its Teachings On Social Virtues, Civic Duties and Commercial Integrity." It was written after R. Yitzchak Elchanan Spector communicated with R. Hirsch telling him of the intention of the Russian government to close the Hederim and Yeshivot in Russia and forbid the printing of the Talmud the teachings of which had been attacked as undermining social morality, commercial honesty and loyal citizenship among Jews. The

essay which was sent by a friendly German prince to the Czar convinced the latter not to put the proposed decrees into practice. It is an essay of tremendous importance because once again it offers us an alternative reading of our tradition, a reading, perhaps, hard to imagine for East European Jews subject as they were to the violent whims of the Gentile population, but certainly a reading which the Rabbiner himself adhered to as a *Gadol* and *Posek*.

To begin with R. Hirsch tells us that "the Talmud . . . teaches that we have human and social obligations to all men, even to heathens and idolaters." Then, however, R. Hirsch turns to the Christian inhabitants of Europe.

This is so with heathens and idolaters; how much more so with non-Jews who serve the God of the Bible, the Creator of Heaven and earth, who keep all the cardinal commandments . . . The Talmud puts them in regard of the duties between man and man on exactly the same level as Jews. They have a claim to the benefit of all the duties not only of justice but also of active human brotherly love.²⁰

To ensure that we do not mistake his intent, R. Hirsch quotes at length from R. Jacob Emden's description of Christians and Moslems. He sees them as having "spread among the nations to the farthest ends of the Earth the knowledge that there is One God . . . And Christian scholars have not only won acceptance among the nations for the written Revelation but have also helped to protect God's originally transmitted Revelation."²¹

After this quote, R. Hirsch tells us that he feels Jews have historically discharged their obligation on all such matters toward non-Jews. Whether this is an accurate historical evaluation is, perhaps, open to question. Yet, what R. Hirsch saw as our ideal as a people is certainly clear.

Only a determined enemy of the truth would deny that the Jews have on the whole conscientiously and gladly carried out the duties and obligations imposed on them by the Talmud of loyalty and obedience to the authorities and of fair dealing and brotherly love towards all

“ONE OF THE HORRIBLE IRONIES OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY IS THAT IN PRECISELY THOSE TWO STATES WHERE JEWS TRIED THE HARDEST TO BE PATRIOTS, GERMANY AND ITALY, WAS BORN THE MOST EVIL AND MANIACAL PERSECUTION OF JEWS BY GENTILES.”

“IN OUR DAILY DEALINGS WITH THE GENTILES WE MUST BE PASSIONATELY AWARE THAT WE ARE JEWS, THE PEOPLE OF GOD AND AS SUCH MUST ALWAYS BEND OVER BACKWARDS TO BE NOT ONLY HONEST, CIVIL AND FRIENDLY, BUT CONCERNED AND COMPASSIONATE AND GIVING.”

their fellow citizens in whose midst they live.^{22,23}

THE PURPOSE OF GALUT

In truth, R. Hirsch's view of Jewish-Gentile relations is rooted in his view of the purpose of *Galut*.²⁴ He sees the exile as a means whereby Jews living exemplary lives rooted in faith, law and morality will lead all of mankind to its ultimate goal which he sees as "uplifting the free gaze to the All-One" by all men. We are to be the true "kingdom of priests and a holy nation."²⁵ This can only be accomplished if we observe a morality universal in nature and a true sanctification of God's Name.

If, however, in the midst of a world which worships wealth and lust, Israel were to live a tranquil life of righteousness and love; if, while everywhere else the generation of man is sinking into the depth of sensuality and immorality, Israel's sons and daughters should bloom forth in the splendor of youth, purity and innocence, ah, what a powerful instrument for good Israel could be! If... every Jew would be a mutely eloquent example and teacher of universal righteousness and universal love; if thus the dispersed of Israel were to show themselves everywhere on earth as the glorious priests of God and pure humanity; if only we were, or would become that which we should be, if only our lives were a perfect reflection of our Law—what a mighty force we would constitute for steering mankind to the final goal of all human education! This would affect mankind more quietly, but much more forcefully and profoundly than ever our tragic record of suffering...²⁶

This is surely a most ambitious agenda, one capable of inspiring us all with its stringent demands rooted in an idealism based on human and Divine love. It is an agenda to which R. Hirsch summons us all hoping that we will become via our faith, ethics, morals, compassion, empathy, etc. perfect vessels to introduce and propagate God's kingdom on this Earth.²⁷

It is, sadly, an agenda that we have to a large degree forgotten. I will make no attempt within the confines of

this article to answer specifically the questions raised at the outset. (Many of the questions would require long and hard thought by true Torah scholars and thinkers.) What we do have, however, are certain working guidelines.

1) If, indeed, the Holocaust has ended Western patriotism as a viable and moral option for the Jew then our creed must be Zionism and our place Israel. We then have no claims on an America to whom we feel we owe nothing. The only imperative is to live quietly and eventually emigrate.

2) In Israel we must never lose sight of other peoples and their sufferings. We must listen carefully (albeit critically for the stakes are so high) to their arguments and we must never forget our role as moral paragon. Arguments based upon comparisons between ourselves and other immoral nations will not do. Our relationships with Palestinians, Arabs and the entire world must be based upon fairness and love, justice and peace in true keeping with Torah ideals.

3) If life in Gentile nations is our choice then we are obligated to be a loyal element in those nations caring about our fellow citizens and the realm as a whole.²⁸ The good of the whole is then our primary concern as it should be of all true patriots.

4) In our daily dealings with the Gentiles we must be passionately aware that we are Jews, the people of God and as such must always bend over backwards to be not only honest, civil and friendly, but concerned and compassionate and giving. In thought, speech, deed and communal policy we must be constantly aware that, despite our special Sinaitic mission, there is one God who has created all men.

Yes, there will be disagreements on specifics. The safety of Israel and Western Jews will always be a priority, but we speak here of mood, of general orientation. It is our conviction that centuries of suffering in Eastern Europe and in the Holocaust has somewhat crippled us in this area. It is understandable, but the time seems ripe for changes that place true humanism and *kiddush Hashem* at the top of what we do ourselves and teach to our children.

This is what Rabbiner Hirsch would have wanted. His Orthodoxy and uncompromising defense of Torah purity make him a suitable guide for our *apikorsas* dominated era. Yet, it is his love for all, rooted in this faith which must also never be forgotten. As he exhorts in *Horeb*:

If you love Me, and because you love Me, love my children; rejoice in their well being . . . Carry in your heart love for God's world, above all for your fellow man . . . Carry love in your heart; it is this which makes you a man and an Israelite.²⁹

May God grant us all to be such men . . .

FOOTNOTES

1. The hidden and vastly more complex question is, what precisely is an American citizen or, alternatively, what is America? Unlike European peoples who can still (in however weakened a way) identify themselves in terms of a common past, culture, tradition, rootedness in place, myth etc. America seems to be nothing more than a political system i.e., a contractual—civil methodology. There seems not to be an America in the sense that there is a Russia or a France, for example, that is a trust (perhaps sacred) cementing all of the soul qualities of life, family and faith together regardless of the particular governmental form in vogue at any time. There is an American form of government, but is there an American Way of Life?

The lack of a common sacred or, at least, cultural trust in America has left its citizens to become the primary victims and, ultimately missionaries of a crass hedonist, exploitive capitalist/ consumerism. This situation, soundly diagnosed in The Scorpion special issue "In Search of America" (Issue 7, Summer 1984), throws much cold water on notions of American patriotism. Patriotism to what? A political system of relativist neutrality? As the philosopher Dr. John Rao puts it, "Americanism" "makes us men without a country, just as it makes us men without a committed faith, an authoritative state, a network of real institutions with traditions and esprit-de-corps, and a history. 'Americanism' seeks to replace the nation with an ideology . . . But ideology cannot take the place of faith, the state, the city or the family. It cannot take the place of a real nation. And, hence, it leaves the American suspended in a limbo which the 'Americanist' would have us believe is a model for the cosmos as a whole." (John Rao, Americanism, The Remnant, St. Paul, No Date Given, pp. 28-29).

Of course, the problem is whether a realm can, indeed, be man centered. Was the American enterprise doomed from the start? As L. Brent Bozell explains, "The fact of the matter is that America was born at a great watershed of history. The idea of God . . . had warred for four centuries with the idea that man is Lord of the world, as represented by Machiavelli, Hobbes and Locke. Both ideas approached the divide of the eighteenth century as competing currents, and both influenced its political thought. But . . . at the end of the eighteenth century, one of them moved decisively ahead; in Europe it rushed over the crest in a cascade of blood; here it lapped almost imperceptibly onto the other side" (L. Brent Bozell, Mustard Seeds, Trinity, Manassas, 1986, p. 88.)

2. The Jewish mystical tradition has much to say on the nature of Jewish and Gentile souls. Of course, the question which must be posed in the reading of the tradition is what is the term *goy* referring to? Both the Meiri (See for example, Bava Kama 37b) and the Rambam (Hilkhos Ma-ahalot Asurot 11:8) see it as describing only idolaters. In fact, the Tanya in a well known passage on the matter (end of Chapter 2) uses the term "umot ovdei gelulim" ("nations, worshippers of idols") when describing the aforementioned distinctions.

3. For a fascinating discussion of the Meiri's original view of this see Jacob Katz "Religion Tolerance in the View of R. Menahem Ha-Meiri in Halakah and Philosophy" (Hebrew) in Katz Ha-Halakah Ve-Kabalah (Hebrew University: 5744, pp. 291-306 and especially 300-306).

4. For a refreshingly novel approach to this matter see Dr. David Hoffman "Problems of the Diaspora In the Shulchan Aruch" in Fundamentals of Judaism (Feldheim, New York, 1949, pp. 181-191).

5. A sketchy outline of nationhood as real as opposed to illusory (as twentieth century materialism would have it) may be found in the Mahabar who writes "... according to the order of reality it is improper for any nation to rule over another because God created each nation separate to itself" (Nezach Yisrael, Chapter 1) Was the Mahabar a forerunner of those opposed to both imperialism and egalitarian multi-racialism? See also R. Yitzchak Elchanan Spector on loyalty to and love for Czarist Russia in Nahal Yitzhak, Introduction and the Mesilat Yesharim's exhortation that we work for tikun achvut ha-medinat ("establishing brotherhood among nations"). (End of the Introduction.)

6. Of what value is the study of ideas and ideals, of knowledge and beauty, if it yields nothing in the realm of action? Among Jews in particular (and especially Torah Jews) what is philosophy and academia devoid of, or little influenced by, the fear of Heaven and God's call to His avodah?

7. Oz ve Shalom—Religious Zionists for Strength and Peace in addition to advocating peace initiatives for Israel also attempts to respond to the questions raised by Kabane. (See for example, Oz ve Shalom, No. 7-8, Summer/Fall 1986 pp. 26-29). Whether they pull it off is another matter. Certainly Kabane has opened the taboo subject of Orthodoxy and pluralist humanism and initiated a debate long overdue.

8. A thoroughly fascinating and long forgotten work on this subject might well be Maurice Samuel's You Gentiles (New York, no date or publisher given, pp. 144-156 especially).

9. A recent notable exception to this rule would be the Lubavitch campaign for fulfillment of the "Seven Mitzvot" by non-Jews. Of course, the Lubavitcher Rebbe has always shown an awareness of the state of Gentile spirituality as in his advocacy of public school prayer. In fact, it was the Baal Ha-Tanya himself who favored Czarist Russia over Napoleon because of an acute sensibility of the link between Jewish and Gentile spiritual well being.

10. Of course, as times change, circumstances can force a person to re-examine cherished assumptions. The question is twofold. 1) Are the Jewish "neo-Cons" now aware of the true (as opposed to the pragmatic) error of their ways?

2) Was the original assertion, say, socialism consciously predicated upon Jewish self interest? As far as the first question goes the answer must be that it varies. Daniel Bell seems a bit more aware of larger questions, Norman Podhertz a great deal less. Irving Kristol seems a bit confused as to whether Jewish interest should be in the citizenry as a whole or just themselves. (For some clearly good intentioned vagueness on his part see Irving Kristol "Christmas, Christians and Jews" (National Review, December 30, 1988 pp. 26-27, 56). The second question relates to the ambiguous nature of all idealism. To some extent all our ideals are projections of self, circumstance and affection. Jewish socialists of the first half of the twentieth century were advocating positions rooted in their peoples' life experiences of that era. The gnawing ethical question is that their positions were expressed in universalist rhetoric based on truth, humanism etc. It is highly conceivable that people are often capable of a self-deceit whereby they couch their self interest in universalist terms.

11. Their endeavor is similar, l'havdil, to that of post Vatican II Catholics striving to support Dignitatis Humanae and post-Conciliar documents on religious/political liberty and square them with traditional and seemingly more self-evident prior teachings.

12. The opinion of the Meiri that monotheistic non-Jews are not subject to lesser standards of morality is well known. What is less well known is that Rav Kook declares emphatically that "the law is like the Meiri's opinion that all Gentiles who are operating under proper human laws are considered like gerim toshavim as regards all of man's obligation." In fact, Rav Kook maintained that even according to those who held differently than the Meiri we are still forbidden to actually apply any double standards. (See Igerot Ha'Reiyah, Mosad Harav Kook, Jerusalem 5722, Volume I, pp. 98-99).

13. Mention should be made here of the famous Be'er HaGolah on Hoshen Mishpat 425: Shin where a view of European Christians strikingly similar to that of Rav Hirsch is articulated with much passion although coming from one living in a much more negative socio-political context.

14. R. Hirsch frequently refers to the verses in Jeremiah XXIX, 1, 4, 5, 7 as a paradigm for Jewish-Gentile relations in exile, "Now these are the words of the letter that Jeremiah the prophet sent from Jerusalem unto the residue of the elders which were carried away captives . . . And seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captive and pray unto the Lord for it . . ."

R. Hirsch comments in the Horeb on this "God . . . demands that every Jew find his own well being only in that of the country and, . . . to work and pray for the welfare of the country—and yet Israel was not to spend longer than seventy years there!" (Soncino Press, 1981, p. 400) (See also the Radak on verse 7, who sees it as a moral obligation upon the Jewish people throughout all exiles not only the Babylonian.)

15. Even the American Right has long since lost its soul. What would the tepid faceless National Review of the 1980's do if General MacArthur or Dr. Max Rafferty were to re-appear today?

16. Horeb, *ibid.*, pp. 460 - 462.

17. The true passion of Hirsch's patriotism comes across in the following heartfelt description of true loyalty. "The heavier the oppression, the greater appeared to them to be the mitzvah . . . when the opportunity was afforded to them of sanctifying God's name by promoting the welfare of the step-motherly state. With heartfelt and genuine affection they clung to the soil upon which their cradles had been rocked, on which they had greeted the first laughter of their children . . . with deep and strong love they clung to the land of their birth . . ." (R. Samson Hirsch, *Judaism Eternal Translated by Dayan Dr. I. Grunfeld*, Soncino Press, London 1956, Vol. 1, p. 129).

18. A brief exposure to the depth of the Hirschian Kehillah's commitment to Germany may be found in the excerpts from the letters sent by the Verein Mekor Chajim to World War I Jewish soldiers. Germany and Jewry are both seen as persecuted idealists deserving of ultimate sacrifice. (See Leo Baech Institute News No. 55/Winter 1988 pp. 2-3).

19. In fact, Jewish support for Mussolini was fairly widespread. Young Jews served as Fascisti and several Jews marched on Rome. This situation continued up until the passage of the anti-Jewish laws and sometimes even beyond! The pain and irony of all this boggles the mind.

20. R. Samson Raphael Hirsch, *Judaism Eternal, ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 168.

21. *ibid.*, pp. 169-170.

22. *ibid.*, p. 170.

23. The Hirschian view of Gentile governments and Christian Europe has a lengthy historical pedigree. For a brief overview of those preceding him who emphasized much of what he later taught (among them, Sefer Hasidim, the Habam Zvi and R. Akiva Eger) see Yonah Emanuel "In the Footsteps of Gedolei Yisrael In Ashkenaz" (Hebrew) in Samson Raphael

Hirsch Mishnato V-Shetaso (*Feldheim: Jerusalem/New York 5749*, pp. 147-150). For a most positive view of Gentile religious leaders in a traditional source see Aryeh Leib Lipkin, *Divrei Yedidya*, (Vilna, 5655, p. 38a).

24. For a passionate presentation of R. Hirsch's view of the positive impact of both Hellenism and Christianity on Gentile nations (Europe in particular) see his essay "Hellenism, Judaism and Rome" (*Judaism Eternal Vol. II*, pp. 187-209). This essay written for a specifically Jewish audience goes even further than the above mentioned article on the Talmud penned for the Czar! It should be noted, however, that in truth R. Hirsch believed that "only a small fraction of Shem's teaching was brought to mankind by the Christian Church . . . and was dimmed by the introduction of a deified human ideal" (*ibid. op.cit. p.195*). In the end R. Hirsch could not escape certain tensions between 1848 political loyalties and traditional patriotism, or between seeing Hellenism and Christianity as positive and positing ethical monotheism as the ultimate goal for the non-Jew. (For a clear articulation of this see "Humanism and Judaism" by R. Hirsch's son Dr. Mendel Hirsch in *Fundamentals of Judaism ibid.*, pp. 167-179).

25. See R. Hirsch's comment on this verse in Exodus 19:6 where he writes "each of you . . . is to become a true priest who by his word and deed spreads the knowledge of God and loyalty to Him . . . and 'holy nation' . . . so is the impression Israel is to make on the world is one of holiness to God . . . a nation which is not to seek its greatness in power and might but in the absolute rule of the Divine Law" (The Pentateuch, Translated and Explained by Samson Raphael Hirsch, *Translated Isaac Levy, Judaica Press, Gateshead, 1982. p. 251*)

26. R. Samson Raphael Hirsch, *The Nineteen Letters (Feldheim: New York, 1960, p. 65)*.

27. However, R. Hirsch did not advocate Jewish social intercourse with non-Jews as a means to achieve this (See his comment on Numbers 23:9) and the comments of noted Hirschians, R. Shalom Danziger and Dr. Mordechai Breuer in the *Jewish Observer* October, 1966, pp. 5-6 and the above cited volume p. 36 respectively. Also, he certainly seems opposed to the idea of pre-Messianic Jewish political autonomy, indeed, quoting the famous "three oaths" (Ketubot 111a) in Horeb (p. 461) to support his thesis. (In fact, when R. Danziger quoted the "oaths" in *Tradition of Spring - Summer 1964* as part of Hirschian theory the editors were so perturbed that they footnoted his essay with critical comments to insure their readers be not led astray). For a thorough treatment of the "three oaths" see Va-Yoel Moshe by the Satmar Rav, ז"ל, and for the other side of the coin try Aim Ha-Banim Smaichah by R. Yissachor Teichtal (*Pri Ha'aretz: Jerusalem, 5743*). Then, thoroughly confused and full of doubt, decide your own perspective.

28. Interestingly, R. Hirsch seems to have been more of a regionalist than a nationalist. He seems to have favored autonomous localities over large empire-like nations. See on his support of independent Frankfurt Robert Libertes, *Religious Conflict in Social Context (Greenwood: Westport, 1985, pp. 189-195)* Throughout most of his life Germany was not unified. He may, perhaps, be seen as a forerunner of those advocating "the Europe of a Hundred Flags." Surely the survival of Estonia, Wales or Croatia is as precious as that of France or Spain. For an introduction to this position see the English journals *The Regionalist*, *Fourth World Review* and *The Scorpion* among others.

29. Horeb, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

DEDICATE A DAY OF LEARNING IN LUACH & LIMUD

IT'S A UNIQUE WAY TO REMEMBER A SPECIAL LOVED ONE



Contact the Development Office
(212) 563-4000
for more information

Luach & Limud Torah Diary is a monthly
publication of the Orthodox Union

